

Amendments to the Drawings

Filed herewith is a new drawing sheet for Fig. 4B. It is respectfully requested that the new drawing sheet be added to the originally filed drawing sheets.

### Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed June 24, 2009. Claim 28 has been withdrawn. Claims 8-10, 13, 18, 23-27 and 29-30 are presented herewith for consideration.

### Objection to Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) because they do not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. A new drawing sheet with Fig. 4B has been added showing a portion of an enclosure 100. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully requested that the rejection on these grounds be withdrawn.

### Rejection of Claims 8-10, 13, 18, 23-27 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 8-10, 13, 18, 24-27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,231,399 (hereinafter “Meng”). Although the Office Action indicates that these claims are rejected over Meng in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,142,833 (hereinafter “Zhu”), the body of the rejection discusses the rejection only in terms of Meng. Therefore, applicants treat the rejection as over Meng alone under §103.

In the rejection, the Examiner acknowledges that Meng does not disclose certain features recited in independent claims 13 and 26. For example, claim 13 recites in part:

a first port situated at an outermost exterior boundary of the system board and facing outward from said outermost exterior boundary, said first port open to an exterior of the system enclosure for accepting a peripheral device from outside the system enclosure.

Claim 26 has a similar limitation. The Examiner acknowledges that “Meng does not disclose the first port being situated at an outermost exterior edge of the system board and facing outward from the exterior edge.” However, the Examiner points to the generic statement included in many patents that says that certain changes may be made to the disclosed details within the principles of the invention.

First, applicants respectfully point out that this statement, by itself, is insufficient to guide one of skill in the art to the claimed invention. All claim limitations are significant, and must be given weight and effect vis-a-vis the patentability of the claims. *Application of Saether*, 492 F.2d 849, 852

(C.C.P.A. 1974). If even a single claim limitation is not taught or suggested by the prior art, then that claim cannot be obvious over the prior art. *Application of Glass*, 472 F.2d 1388, 1392 (C.C.P.A. 1973). Therefore, it is not enough for the Examiner to point to a generic statement as the teaching in the art of the claimed limitations, where the statement says no more than that changes may be made. There must be some specific teaching or suggestion in the art of the claimed limitations.

Moreover, even accepting the Examiner's statement (which, again, applicants do not), it is further respectfully pointed out that the claims recite additional limitations nowhere addressed by the Examiner. That is, even if Meng taught a port "situated at an outermost exterior edge of the system board and facing outward from the exterior edge" as indicated by the Examiner, the claims further recite that this port is "open to an exterior of the system enclosure for accepting a peripheral device from outside the system enclosure." The Examiner has nowhere shown where Meng or Zhu teaches this limitation. Again, without such a teaching, Meng and Zhu, taken alone or in combination with each other, cannot render the claims obvious.

Based on the above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 8-10, 13, 18, 24-27 and 30 be withdrawn.

#### Rejection of Claims 23 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 23 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meng in view of Zhu. Claims 23 and 29 depend on claims 13 and 26, respectively. As indicated above, claims 13 and 29 recite features that are nowhere taught or suggested in either Meng or Zhu, taken alone or in combination with each other. Those arguments are incorporated here. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 23 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Based on the above amendments and these remarks, reconsideration of claims 8-10, 13, 18, 23-27 and 29-30, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner's prompt attention to this matter is greatly appreciated. Should further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for

extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 24, 2009

By: /Brian I. Marcus/  
Brian I. Marcus  
Reg. No. 34,511

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS & DENIRO LLP  
575 Market Street, Suite 2500  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: (415) 369-9660  
Facsimile: (415) 369-9665